UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/003,957	11/15/2001	Edward Clarke	YOR920010760US1	6656

7590   12/30/2004

Louis J. Percello
Intellectual Property Law Dept.
IBM Corporation
P.O. Box 218
Yorktown Heights, NY 10598

EXAMINER
TANG, KUO LIANG J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2122	

DATE MAILED: 12/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/003,957	CLARKE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kuo-Liang J Tang	2122	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _15 November 2001_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-18_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-18_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _11/15/2001_.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Office Action is in response to the application filed on 11/15/2001.

The priority date for this application is 11/15/2001.

Claims 1-18 are pending and have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on
sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3.   Claims 1-9 and 11-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Date et

al., "A Guide to SQL/DS", Addision Wesley Publishing company", 1989 (hereinafter Date).

As Per Claim 1, Date teaches that SQL/DS ("SQL / Data System") is an IBM program

product for the VM and VSE environment. More specifically, it is a relational database

management system for those environments. Access to those databases is performed by means

of some relational language; in the case of SQL/DS, that language is a dialect of the well-known

relational language SQL ("Structured Query Language"). (E.g. see Introduction and associated

text). In that Date discloses a system for dynamic content resolution comprising:

"one or more central processing units (CPUs) and one or more memories" (E.g. see page

26, Fig. 2.2 "preprocessor" & "Main Storage" and associated text");

"one or more source program files (E.g. see page 26, Fig. 2.2 "Source Module and associated text")";

"one or more insert statements (E.g. see page 134, lines 35-39 and 40-46) inserted into the source program file, the insert statement having one or more logical condition statements (E.g. see page 134, lines 39 and 44-47, "WHERE ...") with one or more logical parameters (E.g. see page 134, lines 39, S.S# and SP.S#) and one or more state statements (E.g. see page 134, lines 36-38, "INTO OJEX ...")";

"an insert statement parser (E.g. see page 27, lines 6-13 and page 28, Fig. 2.3 Preprocessor and associated text) that determines a state of the logical condition statement (E.g. see page 134, lines 39, "WHERE S.S# = SP.S#"), selects one of the state statements (E.g. see page 134, lines 36-38, "INTO OJEX ...") associated with the state (E.g. see page 134, lines 39, "WHERE S.S# = SP.S#"), and parses the selected state statement into one or more content source indicators (E.g. see page 134, lines 28-47, Table OJEX)";

"a content source identification process (E.g. see page 28, Fig. 2.3, Preprocessor and associated text) that uses one or more of the content source indicators to determine a content source type and one or more access instructions" (E.g. see page 28, Fig. 2.3, "Modified PL/I Source Module P" & "Access Module for P" and associated text);

"a content source access process (E.g. see page 31, Fig. 2.4, RDS and associated text) that uses the access instructions to access a content source object, the content source object (E.g. see page 26, Fig. 2.2 Object Module and associated text) having content"; and

"a content insertion process that replaces the insert statement with the content accessed from the content source object referred to by the indicators in the source program file" (The

content insertion process, e.g. insert statement shown in Section 8.25, is performed by the

processor shown in Fig. 2.2 & 2.3).

As Per claim 2, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Date teaches:

"where the content insertion process replaces the insert statement in one of the following

ways: a replacement by value (E.g. see page 132, line 31, "VALUES (... 24)") and a

replacement by reference (E.g. see page 132, line 31, "VALUES ('P7', 'Athens', ...)" and also

see page 132, line 18, subquery)".

As Per claim 3, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Date teaches:

"a decision process that decides (E.g. see page 134, lines 39, 44 and 47, WHERE

statement) how the content insertion process replaces the insert statement" (E.g. see pages 134-

135, Section 8.2.5).

As Per claim 4, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated and further Date teaches:

"where the decision process decides to replace the insert statement by one of the

following: a replacement by value (E.g. see page 132, line 31, "VALUES (... 24)") and a

replacement by reference (E.g. see page 132, line 31, "VALUES ('P7', 'Athens', ...)")".

As Per claim 5, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Date teaches:

"where the state statement has at least two content source indicators and the content

source indicators are in a hierarchy of indicators" (E.g. see page 134, lines 29-47, structure Table

OJEX, S and SP).

As Per claim 6, the rejection of claim 5 is incorporated and further Date teaches:

"where the content source access process recursively traverses the hierarchy of indicators

to obtain a set of access instructions at one or more levels of the hierarchy of indicators" (E.g.

see page 31, Fig. 2.4, RDS and associated text).

As Per claim 7, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Date teaches:

"where the content source object is any one or more of the following: a mass data storage

application (E.g. see page 26, Fig. 2.2, Main Storage and associated text), an HTML program

source file, a static file, a memory access, a multimedia data file, text file, XML file, binary data

file, remote file, electronic measurement and live content" (E.g. see page 29, lines 16-23).

As Per claim 8, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Date teaches:

"where one of the content source indicators is a content source type indicator" (E.g. see

page 134, line 38, "FROM   S, SP", where S and SP are table (source type)).

As Per claim 9, the rejection of claim 8 is incorporated and further Date teaches:

"where the content source object is a mass data storage application and the content source

type indicator has a location of the data storage application and the content source type,

respectively"(The location of the data storage is the default database, e.g. see page 26, Fig. 2.2

block DB. And the content source type is the type TABLE stored in the database).

As Per claim 11, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Date teaches:

"where the content source object is a static file and the content source type indicator is a

location of the access instructions" (E.g. see page 291, lines 22-29, sequential file).

As Per claim 12, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Date teaches:

"where the logical condition statement is one or more content source indicators" (E.g. see

page 134, lines 39, Table S and SP).

As Per claim 13, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Date teaches:

"where the source program file contains one or more insert statements and the content"

(E.g. see page 134, lines 44-47).

As Per claim 14, Date teaches a system for dynamic content resolution comprising:

"one or more central processing units (CPUs) and one or more memories" (E.g. see page

26, Fig. 2.2 "preprocessor" & "Main Storage" and associated text");

"one or more source program files (E.g. see page 26, Fig. 2.2 "Source Module and

associated text")";

"one or more insert statements (E.g. see page 134, lines 35-39 and 40-46) inserted into

the source program file, the insert statement having one or more logical condition statements

(E.g. see page 134, lines 39 and 44-47, "WHERE ...") with one or more logical parameters (E.g.

see page 134, lines 39, S.S# and SP.S#) and one or more state statements (E.g. see page 134,

lines 36-38, "INTO OJEX ...") with one or more content source indicators (E.g. see page 134,

line 37-38, (Table S, Sp) and (Field S.* and SP.P#)), where the state statements are nested (E.g.

see page 134, line 44-47) insert statements";

"an insert statement parser (E.g. see page 27, lines 6-13 and page 28, Fig. 2.3

Preprocessor and associated text) that determines a state of the logical condition statement (E.g.

see page 134, lines 39, "WHERE S.S# = SP.S#"), selects one of the state statements (E.g. see

page 134, lines 36-38, "INTO OJEX ...") associated with the state (E.g. see page 134, lines 39,

"WHERE S.S# = SP.S#"), and parses the selected state statement into one or more content

source indicators (E.g. see page 134, lines 28-47, Table OJEX), and creates an insert statement

context that tracks a path connecting the nested insert statements (E.g. see page 134, line 44-47

)";

"a content source identification process (E.g. see page 28, Fig. 2.3, Preprocessor and

associated text) that uses one or more of the content source indicators to determine a content

source type and one or more access instructions" (E.g. see page 28, Fig. 2.3, "Modified PL/I

Source Module P" & "Access Module for P" and associated text);

"a content source access process (E.g. see page 31, Fig. 2.4, RDS and associated text)

that uses the access instructions to access a content source object, the content source object (E.g.

see page 26, Fig. 2.2 Object Module and associated text) having content"; and

"a content insertion process that replaces the insert statement with the content accessed

from the content source object referred to by the indicators in the source program file" (The

content insertion process, e.g. insert statement shown in Section 8.25, is performed by the

processor shown in Fig. 2.2 & 2.3).

As Per claim 15, the rejection of claim 14 is incorporated and further Date teaches:

"where the insert statement parser further attaches context information to the path" (E.g.

see page 134, line 44-47).

As Per Claim 16, is the method claim corresponding to the system claim 1 and is rejected

under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 1.

As Per Claim 17, is the system claim corresponding to the system claim 1 and is rejected

under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 1.

As Per Claim 18, is the computer program product claim corresponding to the system

claim 1 and is rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Date in view of

Wanger, US Patent No. 5,742,845.

As Per claim 10, the rejection of claim 8 is incorporated and further Date does not

explicitly disclose where the content source object is an HTML source program file and the

content source type indicator is a keyword that indicates the content source type as an HTML

type, the content source type being associated with a location of the access instructions for the

HTML source program file. However, Wanger in an analogous art teaches a manner such as

"integrated statements for a file used to generate the HTML files for the client program and the

SQL files for the application program for a key input order with secure payment transaction,".

(E.g. see FIG. 16 and associated text). Therefore, it would have been obvious to incorporate the

teaching of Wanger into the teaching of Date so that the content source object is an HTML

source program file and the content source type indicator is a keyword that indicates the content

source type as an HTML type, the content source type being associated with a location of the

access instructions for the HTML source program file. The modification would have been

obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated so that the user does

not have to manually generate the SQL commands, the HTML commands, and carefully

correlate the data fields of the two commands in order to implement a transaction between a

client and a database

Conclusion

6.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Kuo-Liang J Tang whose telephone number is (571) 272-3705.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM - 7:00PM (Monday – Thursday).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Tuan Dam can be reached on (571) 272-3695. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kuo-Liang J. Tang

Software Engineer Patent Examiner

TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER